

THE NEW TIMES

"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"

Vol. 49, No. 10

OCTOBER 1985

Registered By Australia Post—Publication No. VBH 1001

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AND APARTHEID

Students of psycho-political warfare understand how people can be conditioned to react to certain sounds in the same way that Pavlov's famous dogs reacted to sounds. Although the famous Russian scientist was not a Communist, Lenin realised how Pavlov's experiments in the field of conditioned reflexes could be used to control and manipulate human beings. The promoters of psycho-political warfare have evolved a wide range of "trigger" words to which most people automatically respond in a certain way. One of the most deadly of these words is "apartheid," which is being used in the international revolution to bring South Africa down.

The psycho-political war against South Africa has been so successful that even many supporters of South Africa, particularly present or past politicians, feel it imperative that they preface their support by criticising apartheid. Former Australian Defence Minister, Sir James Killen, in a recent sympathetic article on South Africa felt it necessary to say that he found apartheid "obscene," an offence to all civilised people. Those who recall a series of articles written by Sir James during his first visit to South Africa many years ago cannot recall any references to the alleged obscenity of apartheid, which Sir James then described rather accurately.

A major part of the anti-South African campaign is being carried by sections of the Christian Church, with the Anglicans playing a major role, particularly since the appointment of Desmond Tutu as Anglican Bishop of Johannesburg. Bishop Tutu's highly political stance, and his support for the revolution threatening South Africa, has badly split the Anglican Communion inside South Africa. Financial support for the church has dropped dramatically.

A CAUTIONARY NOTE

At the recent Australian Anglican Synod in Sydney, the Archbishop of Sydney, the Most Reverend Donald Robinson, was the only Church leader to raise a cautionary voice against the motion welcoming the award of the Nobel Peace Prize to Bishop Tutu, urging Australian disinvestments in South Africa, and supporting the Australian government's policy of selective sanctions.

According to press reports, Archbishop Robinson caused considerable feeling with his claim that the South African situation had been over-simplified. He disputed the statement that South African blacks have no political power. He pointed out that blacks "have full rights in their own Parliament, which has, on our terms somewhere between local and State government jurisdiction . . . You mightn't like it, and of course it is wholly inadequate, but it is an area of government, and it is part of the decision-making process."

The media generally fails to report that large numbers of blacks in South Africa are co-operating with the whites in an evolutionary process of self-government, and that the leaders of these blacks are being subjected to violence and even murdered by the revolutionaries.

See, the journal of the Anglican Church in the Dioceses of Melbourne, Bendigo and Wangaratta, Victoria, in its September issue, carries a front page story on Archbishop Trevor Huddleston, who states that apartheid is "blasphemy". A type of roving ambassador for the anti-apartheid movement, Archbishop Huddleston says he is greatly encouraged by the Australian government's anti-South African stand, as he is by the changed American policy. Archbishop Huddleston is President of the British Anti-apartheid movement as well as the international Defence and Aid Fund, both Marxist influenced movements. He worked closely with the Communist Nelson Mandela while living in South Africa. Bishop Tutu was one of his protégés.

Archbishop Huddleston says he is pleased with the changed attitude of the Anglican Church since he wrote his book, *Naught For Your Comfort*, 30 years ago. One of the most misleading and dishonest books ever written on South Africa, it was attacked and rejected by Anglicans in South Africa at the time.

Archbishop Huddleston claims that apartheid is blasphemous "because it was a denial of human dignity." As apartheid means separate development, this is in fact an acceptance of the reality that there are diverse groups of people in the world, and that the individual can best reach his full potential of development where he lives an integrated life amongst people of his own kind.

POPE JOHN-PAUL'S STRANGE VIEWS

Even Pope John Paul has been introduced into the anti-South African campaign in Australia, with a featured article in *The Herald*, Melbourne, of September 9. The headline read: APARTHEID: DENYING THE LAW OF GOD, and the article opened with the statement that "No system of apartheid or separate development will ever be acceptable as a model for relations between peoples or races. For Christians and for all who believe in an unbreakable bond between God and all human beings, no form of discrimination — in law or in fact — on the basis of race, origin, colour, culture, sex or religion can ever be acceptable."

With the greatest respect to the Holy Father, whom we have felt might provide some effective Christian leadership, his remarks are nonsensical and in conflict with views expressed by some of his

OUR POLICY

To promote loyalty to the Christian concept of God, and to a society in which every individual enjoys inalienable rights, derived from God, not from the state.

To defend the Free Society and its institutions — private property, consumer control of production through genuine competitive enterprise, and limited, decentralised government.

To promote financial policies, which will reduce taxation, eliminate debt, and make possible material security for all with greater leisure time for cultural activities.

To oppose all forms of monopoly, whether described as public or private.

To encourage electors always to record a responsible vote in all elections.

To support all policies genuinely concerned with conserving and protecting natural resources, including the soil, and an environment reflecting Natural (God's) laws, against policies of rape and waste.

To oppose all policies eroding national sovereignty, and to promote a closer relationship between the peoples of the Crown Commonwealth and those of the United States of America, who share a common heritage.

predecessors. But did the article in *The Herald* really express the views of the Pope? *The Herald*, misled its readers when it advertised "The Pope writes for *The Herald*." In fact when the column attributed to the Pope did appear, it was copyrighted by "News America Syndicate." It now appears that the column directly attributed to the Pope was a re-statement of some of the Pope's views on world issues, prepared by a "U.S. church expert." It would be instructive to know who this "church expert" is and whether in fact the Pope has expressed himself on apartheid in the terms used in *The Herald* article.

A CHALLENGE TO REALITY

Irrespective of who wrote the views attributed to the Pope, they challenge reality, Truth. True evolution in human affairs has taken place as the result of diversity. It is a natural law that every living form discriminates in favour of its own kind. In doing so it accepts the existence of other forms of life, otherwise there could be no discrimination. Separate development, even among people of the same background, is also a natural law, which, in practice, minimises friction between different groups. The development of the most successful Empire in history, the British, was based upon the principle of separate development, with each British Colony being granted independence and self-government as soon as this was practical. There was unity in diversity.

One of the great liberal heresies of this century is the view that as the electoral franchise is widened, there will be more "democracy" and "progress". C.H. Douglas warned that the irresponsible vote

was similar to providing small boys with matches to do as they liked in a room full of high explosives. Surely not even unrealistic Church leaders can believe that forcing the whites of South Africa into a political system with the various blacks will result in the blacks obtaining more physical amenities or more education than they are receiving now. It would simply provide an even more irresponsible vote to be manipulated by the power-hungry. This has happened in Zimbabwe, formerly Rhodesia. The less said about the rest of "liberated" Africa, the better.

The tragedy of our times is that the Christian Church, as represented by its spokesmen, has lost its way, having been infected by the Liberal and Marxist virus. The case of South Africa demonstrates how selective is the moral indignation of many Church leaders. Irrespective of the standards of judgment, the Soviet Union must be rated a greater threat to human dignity and freedom. The Christian Church is free in South Africa, with millions of black Christians supporting the government. But the Church is not free in the Soviet Union; it is run by secret KGB agents. South Africa has no Iron Curtain to keep victims in the alleged "police state". And it does not promote any programme for world domination.

Perhaps the kindest thing that can be said about the anti-South African Church leaders is — Father forgive them, they know not what they do. The South African situation is a challenge to all Christians to come to grips with realities, to make common cause with their fellow Christians in South Africa who are trying to warn that the revolutionary ferment in their country is, in the main, promoted by skilled Marxist agents.

BLACK US CONSERVATIVE EXPOSES TRANS AFRICA'S IMPOSTURE

In November, 1984, shortly after President Reagan was overwhelmingly re-elected, a brilliantly orchestrated campaign, aimed at achieving SA's total economic, political and military isolation, was launched in Washington by the militant Black pro-Castro, pro-Soviet lobby group, TransAfrica. Soon it had triggered nation-wide demonstrations, had rolled right into Congress, with even Republican conservatives such as Newt Gingrich, Vin Weber, Robert Walker and Mickey Edwards rushing to be in on the kill.

How much did those who so eagerly marched to TransAfrica's drumbeat know of the movement's real agenda of the manipulating forces behind it? Did they ever suspect that this was a Soviet "active measures" campaign against SA — and the West? Or were they simply unquestioning victims of a giant political con game? Answers to that come in *TransAfrica. A Lobby of the Left*, a 35-page position paper just released by two good friends in Washington, the distinguished Black conservative, Jay Parker, and his close associate Allan Brownfeld. Both men, regular visitors to this country know SA — and TransAfrica — very well indeed.

Published under the imprint of Mr. Parker's prestige Lincoln Institute for Research and Education, the monograph mercilessly exposes TransAfrica's shabby impostures. Nor does Bishop Tutu, so heavily involved in the movement's planning, escape unscathed. Trans Africa, it is pointed out, has made clear its commitment to the ANC. And the ANC's commitment? In March 1976 Oliver Tambo, speaking in Moscow, eulogised Soviet support for "Liberation movements," ended with the ringing cry: "Long Live the Communist Party of the Soviet Union!" Speaking in Moscow, March 1980 Alfred Nzo ANC Secretary-General declared:

"Dear Comrades . . . the growing might of the Soviet Union abets fulfilment of the Communist Party's support of people fighting for national and social liberation. In the name of the ANC, permit me to make the highest evaluation of this unending assistance which we receive from the Soviet Union . . . Comrades . . . world reaction is headed by American imperialism which seeks to take the offensive and to stop the people's forward march. (But) the correlation of forces has shifted. . . this is an undeniable fact of history. . . our movement is inspired to take the offensive for crushing Apartheid and establishing a People's Power." Further: "We have complete solidarity with the struggle being waged in El Salvador, Vietnam, Laos, Kampuchea, Palestine, Namibia, etc. Hail to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union! Hail to the unity of the world's anti-imperialist movement!"

Monograph Comment: TransAfrica and its supporters can hardly argue that they do not know the real identity, goals and tactics of the ANC. The record is clear and public available for all to see.

TransAfrica presents its position on SA in moral terms, ostensibly inspired solely by the desire to "help the people of SA". The reality? Writing in the journal *Contemporary Marxism* (No 6 Spring, 1983) Rob Bush, a prominent Marxist-Leninist theoretician and associate editor of the journal, pointed out:

"Revolution will not only change the face of southern Africa as a region, but also the balance of forces on the entire continent and among the core powers of the world system. A revolutionary government in SA could use the countries highly developed governments in Zimbabwe and Namibia. A bloc of such revolutionary states in southern Africa should greatly maximise the possibility of socialist construction in these states and in other parts of the world system."

Monograph Comment: By embracing the ANC TransAfrica has made it clear that its goal in SA is not reform and the creation of a democratic, multiracial society but, instead, the violent overthrow of the existing government and its replacement by a Marxist/Leninist regime, which would do Moscow's bidding on the continent.

Writing in *Review of the News* January 9, 1985 John Rees noted that "confidential documents . . . from inside TransAfrica indicate that its executive director Randall Robinson, has no intention of allowing the public debate on US/SA policies to consider the implications of Soviet control over the ANC. Also to be scrupulously avoided are such themes as how US security would be affected by the loss of access to SA's strategic minerals and the global strategic effect should the Cape sea lanes fall into the hands of a regime allied with the USSR." Further:

"As for the ANC, drafts of Tans Africa documents say SA Blacks have been driven to armed opposition . . . because the SA Government has refused to accede to their legitimate

"THE ESSENTIAL CHRISTIAN HERITAGE"

By Eric D. Butler

This study of the Christian roots of English constitutional developments, with the stress on the value and uniqueness of each individual, is essential background reading for those concerned about the growing attacks on the Australian Federal Constitution. The importance of Magna Carta, English Common Law, and the limiting of the power of governments, clearly outlined.

Price -\$2 posted from all League of Rights

demands. With thousands of Blacks fighting to get into SA, and with economic and civil liberties there being far broader than in the neighbouring Black dictatorships, one begins to note the strong odour of Soviet disinformation."

Monograph Comment: Scenes of starvation in Africa at the present time are among the most horrible the world has witnessed. By any standards Africa is a disaster area. The entire continent provides us with example after example of tyranny, brutality and misery. Despite all this, Trans Africa's concern about Black Africa is non-existent. SA alone is the subject of TransAfrica's scrutiny. Trans Africa and its US supporters seek the isolation of SA by withdrawing US business and investment.

"The goal is not improvement of SA Black economic standards, but deterioration. It is the old Marxist philosophy of 'the worse, the better.' If jobs are lost, poverty increased, training programmes ended, hope lost . . . the result would be the radicalisation of Black South Africans now working within the system to advance themselves. Disinvestment is being advocated, not because things are getting worse in SA, but because they are getting better, encouraging the vast Black majority to reject radical overtures."

Joe Slovo, architect of the ANC's sabotage programmes, and

other ANC/SA Communist Party readers say they are "greatly encouraged" by the growth of the TransAfrica sponsored anti-SA protest movement in the US. "If all this leads to really serious measures by the West against the regime, economically in particular, it will open possibilities for some kind of transformation short of apocalypse."

Monograph Comment: The "fundamental transformation" Slovo and the ANC seek is one in the direction of making SA a Marxist/Leninist state. Anyone familiar with Moscow's goals in southern Africa will have little difficulty in assessing the manner in which the current protest movement is providing much needed aid and assistance towards that. It should be clear to anyone reviewing Trans Africa's record that its concern at the present time is not "racism" in SA but the promotion of radical revolution. In Black African countries such as Angola and Mozambique TransAfrica is not on the side of Black advocates of freedom and democracy, but on the side of the Marxist governments imposed upon unwilling populations by East bloc arms and advisers.

* The Lincoln Institute has provided a notable public service in bringing this material together. Copies (\$7 each or \$4.25 each for orders of 100 or more) can be ordered from the Lincoln Institute, 1735 Desales St, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036.

STRAWS IN THE WIND

By N.A. Hunt

The following article comes from a man who, during many long years in Rhodesia, where he was a District Commissioner, developed a deep understanding of African affairs.

"All is race: there is no other truth."

Benjamin Disraeli, Lord Beaconsfield: "Tancred."

It is a fundamental tenet of Marxism-Leninism that, for Communism to rule the world, the white race must be evicted from its possessions overseas and driven back into Europe.

Recent world history can be seen as simply an account of how Russia, aided by dupes in the West, has gone about making this policy effective.

In Africa, starting from what was once the Gold Coast, we have seen "freedom" and "independence" given one newly named and ramshackle little tribal dictatorship after another. The eviction of the whites from these once prosperous and peaceful colonies has been achieved at a cost in slaughter of blacks by blacks and in human misery and suffering which might have thought excessive by Attila the Hun. As each country was "liberated" it became another Red satellite as the wave of revolution moved steadily southwards in Africa. As each colony succumbed — under pressure from Britain and America, two countries from whom they might reasonably have expected support — it at once became the focus for violence and subversion in the neighbouring state: the Domino theory in operation.

AFTER RHODESIAN BETRAYAL

For instance, the moment Rhodesia became Zimbabwe; the pressure on South Africa was increased, with the results, which we see daily on our screens and read about in our papers.

Apart from South Africa, the only remaining white outpost is now Australasia. Accordingly, the moment South Africa becomes Azania and dissolves into chaos we may expect that Red-inspired unrest and subversion in Australia and New Zealand will increase sharply. Two straws in the wind indicate that this day may be nearer than most Australians think.

The first indicator is the report that South African industrialists and businessmen have called on the Government to resolve the existing crisis by beginning what they describe as "serious negotiations with the whole spectrum of accepted black leaders." The call is said to come from the Associated Chambers of Commerce, the South African Federated Chamber of Industries, the Urban Foundation and a black organisation named The National African Federated Chamber of Commerce and Industries. They are reported to represent between them over 30% of South African employers. Further, President Kaunda, the lachrymator ruler of Zambia, is reported to have been instrumental in arranging talks between "African leaders" and various international firms with branches in South Africa.

One is reminded of the Indian business community in Kenya, presenting motorcar after motorcar to Jomo Kenyatta and his bloodstained thugs in a vain effort to buy their friendship. One

recalls too the Rhodesian business houses which found it expedient to present large parcels of shares to terrorists who suddenly became Board members and "valued colleagues". Not for nothing did Napoleon Bonaparte define a business man as one who would sell his country for a five-franc piece.

Australians and New Zealanders should note this straw in the wind with care. They are next for destruction once South Africa has been "reformed" out of existence. The statements really mean that big business in South Africa has already surrendered. All that they seek to do now is to negotiate the most favourable surrender terms possible.

AUSTRALASIA NEXT

A second straw in the wind indicates the South African business community is not the only ones who think that their country is doomed. Those who behind the scenes control the war against the whites think so too. In fact they have already turned their attention to the next and last stage of the struggle to confine the whites to Europe. This straw is the demand by a Maori academic, one Dr Pauno Hohepa of Auckland University that the whites of Australasia should return to these ancestral lands. The reason is that they have, according to Dr Hohepa, "outstayed their welcome." Dr Hohepa is quite open about what she wants, or what she has been programmed to say that she wants. She is reported as saying: "I represent those who are no longer content with a slice of bread — we want the whole loaf." You cannot say that that is not frank, can you? She does not tell us who made her the representative for the people for whom she claims to speak. Nor does she tell us that until the whites came to her country and showed her one there was no such thing in the Antipodes as a slice of bread, far less a loaf, for her to claim. Australasians may be misled by the sheer effrontery of the claim into treating it as a joke and forgetting it. This would be a grave mistake. It is in fact the first ranging shot of a barrage, which will grow steadily heavier and more dangerous to them.

One must give the Doctor credit for originality as well as cheek. Normally whites are told that they must get out because they are outnumbered by the indigenous peoples and have not granted universal suffrage in the colony under attack. This is represented as "discrimination" against the indigenous people and a heinous crime. Why it should be wrong to discriminate is never explained; it is simply assumed to be bad. The doctor and her sponsors are not at all worried about being accused of discrimination: the whites are to leave because they are white, and for no other reason. If that is not racial discrimination, what is? Yet we may be sure that nobody in that evil cabal the United Nations will point it out, though they are vocal enough about discrimination when they can use it

against South Africa.

MANIPULATING THE NON-EUROPEANS

Since in Australasia the whites outnumber the coloured peoples, the usual parrot-cries about "democracy" will not serve. Instead, the whites are simply told that they must go: "they have overstayed their welcome." This simply means that the coloured races, lacking the ability to do what the whites have done yet wanting what they have made, propose simply to take it. It would be more accurate to say that the coloured races will be manipulated into a confrontation with the whites, the object being the destruction of Western civilisation and the eviction of the whites.

Throughout Australasia a marked increase in treason, subversion and terrorism may be expected, the pattern being that which has become so familiar elsewhere. The task of those controlling the attack on the whites has been made far easier by the lunatic actions of past governments in steadily eroding the White Australia policy. All that this abject truckling to "world opinion" has achieved is to ensure that all coloured agitators have plenty of stooges of their own race in the white citadel. Another result of the policy change is that the white power structure has been quite unnecessarily — and almost certainly quite deliberately — weakened.

Australians and New Zealanders should realise that they stand absolutely alone against this assault. There is no hope of help, or even of moral support, from either Britain or the United States. Rotten as they both are with multi-racialism, they will be in the forefront of the attackers, currying favour with those in the so-called Third World who rightly despise them.

We shall now begin to see in the Antipodes a movement calling for "reform", "a more just society", "a fairer distribution of the national wealth" and all the other clichés with which we are all so wearily familiar. Why not? Meaningless thought they are, these clichés have been successful elsewhere in hustling the white man out. Why should it not be the same in Australia?

Only a return to the politics of race can now save the whites in Australia and New Zealand. Unless they elect a government, which will act in the interests of the whites, and of the whites alone, they are for the dark.

THE LESSON OF RHODESIA

Those tempted by the siren song of "power-sharing" might learn a lesson from the fate of Rhodesia. The Rhodesians were crazy enough to try sharing power. Today there is no Rhodesia, and the few whites that have been unable to get away have no power left to share. The blacks have both the country and the power, and they are not sharing with anyone.

The same will be the case when South Africa becomes Azania. Australians should ask themselves why they think that things will be different in their case? They most certainly will not be different.

Edmund Burke remarked that: "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing." There is no doubt that the destruction of white rule in Australia and New Zealand would be a triumph of evil. The time left in which the whites can act to save themselves grows perilously short.

THE GROUP VERSUS THE MAN

From "Home" U.K. August-September issue. Available from 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, England.

Archbishops of the Established Church are unlikely to be less than clever, learned and able men, far more so than most of their critics, including us; also worldly wise as becomes their high rank in The Establishment, probably holier not merely than thou but than most of us, and obligatorily well-meaning, being the dignified mouthpieces of the intellectual attitudes of the age, which have so manifestly been paving the road to Hell.

These thoughts have been aroused by certain remarks attributed to our two present Archbishops. First, Dr Habgood, his Grace of York, speaking in the Synod Debate on the ordination of women as deacons, was reported (*Church Times*, 5 July, 1985) to have criticised those who opposed the measure as "old-fashioned", referring to: "the rediscovery of the representative nature of the ministry . . . if more than half the church consisted of women, how could the ministry be representative unless women were part of it."

What concerns us here is not so much the ministry of women as the faith which is appealed to in its promotion — the secular religion of 'polities', the blind, unchallenged, undebated belief in numerical representation of depersonalised units of electorate, which, indeed, once had some meaning on the scale in which elector and representative could be known to each other as persons, but on the

modern scale, with the modern centralised mass-media penetrating daily into every home, is becoming increasingly an oppressive caricature of democracy, a one-way street leading us to disaster.

Far from bringing the wisdom and authority of nearly 2000 years of Christian order and experience to bear upon the challenge of the spiritual errors, which oppress the common people, our Church leaders have turned the Established Church into an anaemic imitation of the partisan shouting shop in Westminster with which most of us are both bored and disillusioned. Those of us who turn to the Church for relief from the transient squabbling for worldly power to the eternal verities are liable to find, unless we are lucky, that it is the eternal, the God-revealed, essence of our religion which is being questioned, which, in the light of the 'superior' wisdom of current fashions in thought is regarded as 'controversial' and debatable, and therefore dubious, — including Christ's own choice of male apostles continued by them into the priesthood, and even the central doctrines of Christianity, the virgin birth, the Resurrection, and the Incarnation itself.

We understand very well that the 'media' make the most of any controversy or doubts cast upon the Christian faith in what is often intended as theological discussion, probing the truth; but even where a few may be edified, mischievous selective publicity can wither the faith of thousands. Why cannot so many of our clergy understand that liturgies and sacraments are of spiritual value to us only if they express and strengthen the *Christian* faith in us, which can be judged only by its fruits — our outlook, our objectives and policies, both in our personal lives and in Society? If the result, in such practical terms, of participation in the sacraments is indistinguishable from that of an agnostic Humanism or an atheistic socialism, why bother about them? They are reduced to tinkling symbols.

No better example could be given of where the practical priorities in the religion of many, perhaps most, of our more prominent churchmen lie than in the contrast between their attitudes to South Africa, in their eyes, has transgressed against the Creed of representative Government, she has offended against the sacred statistical vote and the holy conquest of the majority, she has committed the crime of discrimination between people and sinned against the dignity of man — which (it follows) is a property conferred upon the people by politicians by awarding them the status of equal and indistinguishable, depersonalised, deracinated, dehumanised units of numerical feedback to the propaganda of power-seeking parties. To these churchmen South Africa is an abomination, a pariah among the nations, a blasphemy against their god, who made us all equal and who wills our ultimate unity as a collective mass under the remote control of World Government. They will know no peace until 'Justice' is done, even if, as seems probable, it costs a million lives and reduces South Africa to a Zimbabwe, a Uganda, an Ethiopia under atheistic Marxist control.

On the other hand, though the communist nations seem also to have offended, this is sad, but clearly regarded as less serious. They have merely denied God and forbidden the teaching of Christianity and the upbringing of children in the faith. These matters are, by implication debatable. They are matters of opinion in which our prelates disagree with them, but no useful purpose would be served by breaking off the dialogue when they have so much common ground with them in those fundamental beliefs which lie behind their shared detestation of South Africa.

THE BIG IDEA

Which brings us to a remark of his Grace of Canterbury reported in an article by Margot Lawrence (*Daily Telegraph*, 12 July, 1985) to the effect that: —

"the function of the Anglican Church is to cease to exist, and be absorbed into the larger whole."

How on earth did Christianity get mixed up with the idea of Bigness, or the churches come to trail along behind the Great Financial Corporations in the business of merger (as a longed for 'ideal') into ever vaster groups of people under the ever more remote control of fewer and more inaccessible bosses? Is unity of the spirit to be identified with centralised management, whether or not it is described as 'ecumenical'?

It would indeed be a huge help to the man now so seldom 'in the pew', if he knew what 'the pew' meant, if our spiritual pastors and directors in all the churches would make it clear to which religion they give priority under the new 'larger' title of Judaeo-Christianity. Is this the religion of our fathers and of the Christ who is the same yesterday, today and forever, or is it a liturgical ideology of World centralist collectivism? May it perhaps aspire after the merging of our churches into an even 'larger whole' — a grand Judaeo-Christian-Islamic-Buddho-Hindu-Shinto-animist-agnostic-atheist-Marxist religion of World Unity? After all, a group is much *larger* than a

NEW TIMES—OCTOBER 1985

man!

As for the tacking on of the prefix Judaeo-, if this refers to the Judaic origins of Christianity, to which form of Judaism does it refer? To the religion of those worldly powerful and influential Jews who persecuted and killed the prophets and the Christ, or to that of those humble and insignificant (in the worldly sense) Jews who endured that persecution unto glory? Are not these the prototypes for all of us in all ages, whether for Jew or gentile?

In a letter to *The Times* (1 June 1985) the Chief Rabbi declared that:

"In Judaism, the acceptance of corporate responsibility has always been regarded as a supreme ideal." This applied both to the guilt and to the credit attached to acts even by a single Jew, the first requiring "collective remorse and expiation".

The difference of this from Christianity is crucial. It demonstrates that 'anti-Semitism', the blaming of all Jews collectively for the evil done by some of them, whether for the Crucifixion, or for the misuse of power wielded through finance and the public media, is primarily a Judaic attitude, widely diffused among non-Jews including those who call themselves Christians, but totally at variance with Christianity, which holds a man to be free and personally responsible for his actions, and that Christ came to save sinners (i.e. people) not groups or collectivities, and only by their own choice.

TRINITY — OR UNIFORMITY

It is high time that these matters were publicly faced and clarified by those with authority in religion. Do we worship a Trinity, or Uniformity? Is Creation an act of differentiation, or personalisation, or of centralisation and homogenisation? When, the Church describes itself as the Mystical Body of Christ, is Christ a Person — the Second Person of Trinity — as we have been taught through the centuries, or the group-soul of a vast, collectivised tonnage of man flesh?

For a generation now the words 'dogma' or 'doctrine', meaning the very core of Christian belief, have been jeered at as matters merely for 'academic' debate taking second place to the 'moral' and 'practical' demands of egalitarian collectivism, the religion which now dominates more than half the world with manifestly disastrous consequences. Yet the desperate practical importance of a clearly held Christian faith becomes more obvious every day, in such matters as the survival of the home, the marriage, the family, and the civilisation, which depends upon them.

Fortunately, we in Great Britain are not restricted for our spiritual leadership to those Bishops of Bray and those Reverend Mr. Pliables selected for maximum publicity by our largely atheistic of pagan media. As always, the unsensationally normal and unbent are left mainly in obscurity, but in addition we have also our Defender of the Faith in our Sovereign, who, with her family, has given us a permanent example of consistent Christianity, adapted to external and ephemeral change only in inessentials.

Finally, in the month of August when she celebrated her 85th birthday, it should be placed on record that a whole nation which is being alienated from the Church, has turned towards that 'dear and honoured Lady' the Queen Mother, as a *reliable* exemplar of Christian goodness throughout a Century of unceasing and centrally imposed change.

SACRIFICING PRIVATE HOME BUILDING

By Neil G. McDonald

Cranes crowd the skyline. Capital works-office blocks, skyscrapers, overpasses and shopping complexes are being built at the expense of our most vital need — private housing.

Millions of misapplied dollars poured into railway loops, trade centres and high-rise hotels would have built an extra 60,000 houses — at a conservative estimate.

House building is stagnating. Many carpenters work a lifetime on every kind of building except a house. Their energies are harnessed into formwork, bridge construction, lift wells and maintenance.

Today a house can be built in one-tenth the time it took our forefathers. The era of hand tools, thatch, shingles, slates, mud-bricks and hand ripped timber has been "bombed out" with the zoom of power tools.

Gang nailers have replaced rafters with trusses. Ceilings have lowered; open arches have replaced doors. Chimneys have disappeared with front fences and coolgardie ice chests.

NEWTIMES—OCTOBER 1985

A MESSAGE FROM SOUTHERN AFRICA

By Ivor Benson

A brilliant booklet which answers all the nonsense about the "evils of apartheid". This is an address given by Mr. Benson in Australia in 1972. Prophetic.

\$1.50 from Box 1052J., G.P.O., Melbourne, or all League bookshops.

One builder confessed that today's profits come from — "not what we put in, but what we leave out."

Yet, today's houses have adequate quality and attractive designs.

Now, another jump in home loan interest rates — the third during 1985, has pushed the Great Australian Dream of home ownership out of reach of most young Australians.

The average price of a Melbourne house is \$72,000. If a couple can muster a deposit of \$12,000, they might be able to borrow \$60,000. At 13.5 per cent interest, monthly repayments are about \$700. It takes a two-income family earning over \$25,000 annually to qualify.

On that income, direct taxation takes nearly 50 per cent. So, the prospective dweller works from New Year's Day to early June for nothing.

A few years ago, a block of land was one tenth of the final cost. Now land is about one third, partly due to compulsory road construction, kerbing, etc.

A generation ago, improvements came slowly and matched available income. First was the block, which was paid in full before the basic house was built. Later, came water, sewerage, paths, fences and garage.

Now, luckier young marrieds start off with everything including wall-to-wall carpet and built in cupboards and robes. Fine, except that these items are paid off over thirty or forty years . . . the interest bill must be enormous?

Very few young marrieds are able to put a financial housing noose around their necks and swing for forty years.

They must escape to an acute rental market while the potential builders saws' are silent.

House building needs a mammoth buzz.

There needs to be a two-year moratorium on concrete jungles — commercial and public works.

No physical reason exists why houses cannot be built to satisfy those prepared to pay no more than one week's earnings each month.

Only a century ago, houses and cathedrals were built entirely without financial debt. There is no need for "never never" debts on the West Gate bridge and other completed projects. Physically, all materials have been used and assembled . . . manpower has been paid. An asset has been constructed and all services should be automatically written off. Our financial symbols do not reflect true physical facts. Interest payments to posterity for fictitious national deficits is magnified "mumbo jumbo" which makes Australians pay excessive interest doubling the price of their homes.

Orthodox finance leads only to a lifetime of debt bondage.

If housing is physically possible, it must also be financially within range of those who are prepared to pay a manageable contract price, which is fixed for the agreed period.

Interest rates rising and adding an extra \$10,000 or more shows that Australia with the "world's best treasurer" needs to put its own house in order.

BASIC FUND SET AT \$50,000

The Australian League of Rights Basic Fund for 1985-86 has been set at \$50,000. Mr. David Thompson, the able young West Australian who set the New Zealand League of Rights on its present well-organised basis, has volunteered to join the Australian League of Rights full time, a tremendous manifestation of faith by a young married man. The need to give was never greater — the nation trembles on the brink of horrendous disasters. Supporters are urged to "get the ball rolling" immediately.

The Political Problem

By C. H. DOUGLAS (1946)

It is a curious commentary of our carefully directed educational system that what is perhaps the most quoted phrase of that useful tool of international Finance, Abraham Lincoln—"Government of the people, for the people, by the people"—is an exposure and condemnation of Lincoln himself. What is a people?

The United States in 1861 consisted broadly of two Anglo-Saxon settlements, the "Yankees" or new Englanders, in the North, the descendants of the bitter Puritans of the Massachusetts Bay Settlement, and the Southern land-owners, very much of the George Washington type, the Lees, Randolphs, the cadets of many Scottish Lowland families. Hereditarily, these were a "people" in any usual sense of the word. The rest of the population was an undigested mass of Dutch, German, and Mid-European elements, the disappearing "Red Indians," and the Negro slaves.

It is only necessary to contemplate these unquestionable facts to be convinced that Lincoln's words are "a tale told by an idiot, all noise and fury, signifying nothing." Two parts of the only recognisable whole led the two sides of the American Civil War: Lincoln's actual policy (*i.e.*, the policy of which he was the visible executive) contradicted almost every one of his spoken statements—as for instance, his declaration that any country had a right to secede if it had the power—and a cold analysis of his most publicised apothegms indicates that they can bear any meaning which it may appear desirable to read into them.

If the orbit of the ideas for which Lincoln's verbiage was supposed to be the expression were bounded by the North American Continent, they might be left to work out their true meaning, as they are doing today, on the graveyard of the noble redskin. But of course, they did not originate in America, and they are not confined to it. Lincoln's travesty of "Democracy" is the sheet anchor of the Supreme State; *vox populi, vox Dei* is the travesty and blasphemy of the Immanence of Good; and Tool Power Politics is the Incarnation as manifested in the Coming of the Prince of This World, the False Messiah.

Nothing is more remarkable in matters of politics than the sheer inability of even thoroughly honest and well-intentioned people to realise the consequences of their opinions.

There are as many definitions of "democracy" as there are men; yet, in fact, as has been admirably expressed in an Australian Broadcast, the key to democracy is to reduce a problem to the limits of interest and understanding of those concerned. That is to say, democracy is not so much a question of the mechanism of voting (although that is not of negligible importance); but rather a rigorous exclusion of matters for which the franchise is too wide: and at present the number of persons who think they understand everyone's business, but cannot manage their own, would suggest simple electoral issues.

It is not too much to say, I think, that anyone who cannot grasp this simple idea, or, having understood it, will not admit its validity, is unworthy of a vote and is a public danger if in possession of it. In the light, which it throws upon the limitations of democratic theory, it is perfectly understandable that the condition of the world in general and Great Britain in particular has deteriorated in proportion to the extension of the ballot-box plot. No one would give a child of six a ten-pound note, turn him loose with a box of matches in a firework shop, and tell him to set off the pretty rockets. But that is exactly what has been done

by giving the initiative to an uninstructed—worse, a misinstructed—electorate, and allowing it to provide something claimed to be a mandate to interfere in the business of everyone having "a vested interest."

There are many matters, which require attention; but interference with them will only deliver us from bad to worse until we can admit that power without understanding is the tool of the Devil. There is only one worse thing than the fool in politics and that is the technical expert who knows everything about his business except its legitimate object. We have often miraculously survived the former; but the latter shows signs of writing our epitaph.

The World Plot

It is a curious fact that the decreasing numbers of people who pour scorn on "World Plot" explanations of the present state of the world (not of one country only) do not appear to recognise the implications of their opinion. If they were right, the present discontents are inherent; we can do nothing more about them than we can do about the normal equipment of mankind with two legs and two arms. But if the "Plot" theory is correct then we can deal with it, great though the difficulties may be. Either all men are alike, as the Socialists would have us believe; or some are turned to the Light, and some love the Dark. That is the awful interpretation of the Judgment.

—A note by C. H. Douglas (1947).

MALCOLM FRASER AND THE OXFORD INFLUENCE

Oxford University has produced more than its share of traitors, one of the most notorious being Kim Philby.

It also produced the former Australian Prime Minister, Mr. Malcolm Fraser, currently projected as an authority on South Africa advising the United Nations.

Mr. Fraser has recently spent a whole three days in South Africa, the first time he has ever visited this country.

It is obvious that Mr. Fraser made his fleeting visit only to reinforce his own prejudices, which were formed at an early age.

Mr. Fraser had few white friends at Oxford, where he was described as extremely dull by one of his tutors. His close friends came from Africa.

It has recently been claimed by one of Malcolm Fraser's former political colleagues, Senator Jessop of South Australia, that Fraser was an active member of the Anti-Apartheid movement while at Oxford. The Anti-Apartheid Movement has always been Marxist oriented.

As Prime Minister, Mr. Malcolm Fraser enthusiastically endorsed the Marxist-backed Aboriginal land claims movement set in place by the Whitlam Socialist government. He encouraged non-European immigration and is a strong supporter of multi-racialism.

Malcolm Fraser has a pathological hatred of South Africa, as he did of Rhodesia. Irrespective of whether he knows it or not, his anti-South African campaign at the United Nations and elsewhere is bringing great delight to the Moscow strategists. Lenin spoke of the "useful idiots." That perhaps is the best description of Malcolm Fraser.

MAJORITY RULE

Here is food for thought for the protagonists of majority rule: "If 25 people divide 13 to 12, are we to assume that the 12 are right? And if one among them should change his vote, would truth shift with him to the other side?"

— American writer John T. Flynn

NEW TIMES—OCTOBER 1985

TO THE POINT

The recent establishment of a Soviet Embassy in Lesotho, Southern Africa, with the Embassy under the control of a top official of the Soviet Communist Party, provides further evidence that the campaign to isolate and to destroy South Africa is being rapidly intensified. The use of the pocket State of Lesotho recalls a little known historical fact: that when the Union of South Africa was created by the British, there was a suggestion that the Protectorate of Lesotho, Bechuanaland (Botswana) and Swaziland should be brought in to the Union. When the British failed to do this, it led eventually to these Protectorate gaining self-government and the right to develop as separate entities. This is the essence of the original apartheid principle.

Self-styled conservatives around the world continue to claim the Thatcher government in Britain as a successful example of conservative government. There is only one thing wrong about the "success"; it is paving the way for what could be the most revolutionary government in British history. While British Tory governments have in the main often shown some sense in foreign affairs, their domestic policies have been disastrous. No genuine conservatism is possible until the grip of financial orthodoxy is broken.

Taiwan is finding that its relations with the U.S.A. are being increasingly soured as a result of Taiwan, like Japan, establishing what the certified economists describe as a "favourable balance of trade." A recent delegation of American Senators to Taiwan warned that unless Taiwan acted soon to redress the imbalance of trade, the American Congress would have to act with protectionist measures to restrict exports from Taiwan to the U.S.A. Taiwan was told that it must permit more American exports into Taiwan. An industrialised geared to the same financial orthodoxy as other industrialised nations, desperately attempts to solve her internal problems with greater exports. Already Taiwan exports to the Eastern European Communist bloc and will find it increasingly difficult to resist the lure of exporting to mainland Communist China.

Real interest rates in Australia, now the highest since 1926, are having a devastating effect on home purchasers and small businessmen. The high interest rates are in part the indirect result of the Hawke Government's "tight" financial policy. The high interest rates are, of course, resulting in a flood of foreign investments. Australians were told that when foreign banks were permitted to operate in Australia, interest rates would come down. The financially orthodox argue that interest rates must be permitted to go up, otherwise the banks will not be able to attract sufficient funds for re-lending purposes. It is incredible that there are still people who believe that banks can only lend their deposits.

The prices for American farm production have fallen from between 15-20 per cent since June. Decline in farmers' incomes has made it impossible for growing numbers of American farmers to service their heavy debts to the banks. Rural communities are being decimated right around the free world, not because they have failed to produce sufficient food but because of the debt-inflation system.

A recent headline says that Comrade Mugabe of Zimbabwe "assumes Statesman's role for confrontation with South Africa." Mugabe is at present using his North Korean trained troops to assist his fellow Marxist Samora Machel in neighbouring Mozambique, who has been having a hard time trying combat anti-government rebel troops. The rebels have also made it almost impossible for Zimbabwe to use Mozambique to export, thus making Mugabe almost completely dependent upon the South Africa he is pledged to help destroy. The imposition of international sanctions against South Africa would place Mugabe in a most difficult position. Thus the use of his troops in Mozambique. Needless to say, the creators of "world opinion" are not attacking Mugabe's use of troops outside his own borders. This type of action is only a crime when the South Africans are forced to send their troops in to Communist-dominated Angola.

The most significant comment on the spy controversy between Britain and the Soviet Union was the departure of a group of Scottish businessmen who flew to Moscow immediately the controversy started. Welcoming the businessman in Moscow, the British Ambassador, Sir Bryan Cartledge said that their presence

was "logical and valid." It was proof of Britain's determination to strengthen trade despite the spying row. All types of treachery are to be deplored. The visit of the British businessmen was proof of the determination to try to solve Britain's internal problems by increased exports, even if these strengthen the Soviet enemy. Soviet strategists understand all this, as did Lenin when he predicted that the "decadent capitalists" would provide the rope for their own hanging.

The latest race riots in Birmingham, England, are part of a pattern of racial and cultural friction in every part of the world where the multi-racial programme is being attempted. Americans are becoming increasingly concerned with the flood of illegal immigrants from Mexico, Haiti and elsewhere. A recent report from New York outlines violent clashes between Koreans and other ethnic groups. Violence continues in Sri Lanka, India and Pakistan. Reality constantly conflicts with the theories of the liberal idealists. The distinguished Jewish writer, Dr Oscar Levy, commented that the ideal is the enemy of the real. There are no race riots in Japan, where the official policy is to maintain a homogeneous people.

The Australian Young Democrats have called for a further reduction in the voting age, to 16. It is claimed that those under 18 years of age are being "discriminated" against. But why stop at 16? All those under 16 are also being "discriminated" against. Should not all those children who can read and write also have a vote? Large numbers of Africans who cannot even read or write are voting — at least they put a mark indicating whether they support the elephant or the monkey party. With all children voting, we could see the emergence of "kiddy power". Recently in a country centre in Victoria, kindergarten children marched in a "peace" demonstration. C. H. Douglas pointed out the urgent necessity of responsible voting, which each individual being made personally responsible for how he cast his vote.

It is not often that we agree with the Rev. Jerry Falwell of the American "Moral Majority". But he was correct when, following a visit to South Africa, he described Bishop Tutu as a "fraud" who did not represent the majority of black Africans. But we wait with interest to see if Zionist Jerry Falwell continues with his promise to campaign for the Reagan policy on South Africa when President Reagan has now retreated in the face of Zionist pressure. The Zionist machine is fueling the anti-South African campaign in the U.S.A.

In his famous classic, *Witness* Whittaker Chambers wrote: "Security shatters, not because they are no more locks, but because the men naturally trusted with the keys and combinations are themselves the conspirators."

Further confirmation of the reality of treachery amongst Western security organisations has been provided by the revelations concerning top West German security officials. The growing incidence of treachery can be explained not only by the gross materialism of the times, but by the breakdown in old-fashioned loyalty called patriotism. Patriotism is today derided, while internationalism is extolled.

In the chapter, "The Development of Ideological Motivation", published in Mr. Eric D. Butler's book, *The Real Communist Menace*, of the 1947 Royal Commission's Report, the following comment appears: "... a sense of internationalism seems in many cases to play a definite role in one stage of the (Communist) courses. In these cases the Canadian sympathiser is first encouraged to develop a sense of loyalty, not directly to a foreign state, but to what he conceives to be an international ideal. This subjective internationalism is then usually linked almost inextricably through the indoctrination courses and the extensive exposure to the

propaganda of a foreign state, with the current conception of the national interests of that foreign state and with the current doctrines and policies of the Communist parties throughout the world."

A recent press headline says "Canberra goes to war over US plans for wheat sale subsidy." Debt-finance makes it imperative that nations strive to solve their internal problems by obtaining a "favourable balance of trade". This means greater exports and less imports, a physical loss. The loss is masked by financial orthodoxy. Japan has been too successful in exporting, so the USA has told Japan there will be trouble unless Japan takes action to correct the situation.

But now the United States is upsetting Canberra by a proposal to subsidise wheat exports to countries now buying wheat from Australia. The Americans are trying to placate their farmers, who have produced record surpluses, which have become an embarrassment. Much of the surplus food production is the result of a continuing inflation, which drives producers on to keep increasing production in an attempt to keep in front of rising costs.

The USA is now threatening reprisals against all those countries, which will not open their markets to American communications equipment. President Reagan constantly says that he supports free trade. But under his own debt financial policy, President Reagan is a captive of developments over which he has no control.

Once again the U.S.A. government has had to increase the national debt limit, to \$US 2 trillion. Irrespective of the label of government, the debt structure must continue to rise under present financial policies. Increased debt means higher taxation to pay the interest. This helps to ensure that continuous inflation is mathematically certain. And inflation distorts the whole economy and makes social stability impossible. As the presentation of the facts over more than half a century have not halted the policy of debt finance, it is clear, as Douglas said, that only harsh events are going to force a change. We can predict with certainty that those events are going to take place.

THE SHAH OF IRAN'S STORY - A MESSAGE FOR SOUTH AFRICA

The following text is an excerpt from the book "The Shah's Story" written by the Shah himself (first published in Great Britain by Michael Joseph Ltd, 44 Bedford Square, London WC1, 1980).

Mass Media — the mass media played an important part in the unfolding of events in my country during the last three years. The competition of journalists in search of ever more sensational news has led to the most regrettable excesses. It must be remembered that any journalist could come and see what he wanted, and write what he wanted, and publish what he wanted. What would have been reported if, as is now the case, our frontiers had been closed to the press?

Involvement of religious leaders — The subversion originated from liberals and left-wingers who were supported from outside by groups and individuals whose one objective was to overthrow the regime. It was not until the beginning of 1978 that certain mullahs suddenly appeared in the midst of the subversive front. It was only then that little by little, as disorder spread throughout the country, an increasing number of mullahs and ayatollahs allowed themselves to be carried away by the general current of folly. The accursed "Alliance of the Red and the Black" has supplied the blinded mullahs with a few, but efficient, organizers.

Liberalization — The agitation and incessant propaganda of so-called "democrats" amounted to a bid against my own programme of liberalization, the tempo of which had accelerated. It was not long before I was to realize that it was a challenge, in the real sense of the word. The more I advanced along the path of liberalization, the worse the situation inside the country became. Every initiative I took was interpreted as a proof of the weakness of my government.

Bereavement tactics — They started after six riot victims were killed on January 7, 1978 and from that moment those who were manipulating the crowds were able to mobilize them for new demonstrations. There was every likelihood that these

demonstrations, because of their violence, would quickly degenerate into new riots in which more people would be killed. Thus the anger of a credulous and fanatical crowd could be whipped up to fever pitch.

The revolutionary youth — Least of all can I forgive the trouble-makers for having used the majority of our students for their own ends? They needed large gangs and they found them in the universities, and, before long, even in the schools. They set out systematically to intoxicate our youth. Unfortunately they succeeded.

Pre-revolutionary situation — It is obvious that the pre-revolutionary state in which we found ourselves had been carefully worked on. In the larger towns where martial law was still in operation, harassment groups had been formed. These groups were armed with automatic rifles and explosives, the indispensable trappings of urban guerilla warfare. Soon the order went out for them to attack embassies and government offices. The country had to be brought to the brink of chaos as quickly as possible.

Strikes — Then began the strikes, which were to bring the country to her knees. There were power cuts lasting several hours each day, transport strikes, water and oil were cut off; then banks and the most important ministries closed one after another or all together, and paralysed the nation. Idle crowds thronged the streets, growing all the while more bitter.

The US appears on the scene — At the beginning of January 1979, I was amazed to learn that General Huyser had been in Teheran for several days. Though the visit of the US General was surrounded in total mystery, it became clear that the American leaders' concern was to prevent a military coup in Iran. General Huyser stayed in Teheran for several days after my departure. What happened? All I know is that General Rabii, Commander-in-Chief of the Iranian Air Force, said to his "judges" at the travesty of a trial which preceded his execution: "General Huyser threw the king out of the country like a dead mouse."

A NEW INSTANT EXPERT ON SOUTH AFRICA

Victorian Federal Liberal M.P., Mr. Ian Macphee was well known for his strong anti-South African stance long before he made his recent, first, visit to that country.

Mr. Macphee creates the impression of a man whose mind was made up about South Africa and was determined not to be confused by the facts. Mr. Macphee is a strong supporter of multiculturalism, but like all those who hold to this ideal never offers no examples of the successful multi-cultural society. There are none. Writing in *The Age* Melbourne of September 2, Mr. Macphee states "The National Party Government is one of the most intransigent, repressive and brutal in the world." We hold no brief for the South African Government, but if it is a "brutal" and "repressive" as Mr. Macphee claims, then why does it tolerate a free press which has in the main never ceased criticising the government? Why does it permit critics like Bishop Tutu to be interviewed and given extensive publicity by the South African Broadcasting Commission? Why is there no Iron Curtain on the Limpopo to stop the alleged victims of this "repressive" regime from fleeing northwards to "liberated" Africa?

Mr. Macphee does not explain why blacks have been attacking and killing Indians in Natal. He sheds no light on why blacks are murdering other blacks. The truth is that the Macphees of the West will never understand the basic problem of South Africa. Their minds are divorced from reality by their liberalism.

Mr. Macphee's divorcement from reality is demonstrated by the following from his *Age* article:

"Having spoken with many black leaders both within and without South Africa I am confident that if blacks were brought into the political process now they would apply themselves energetically and creatively to the forging of a new constitution embracing the principles espoused in Magna Carta, the U.S. Declaration of Independence and the UN Declaration of Human Rights.

"They would be anxious to protect minority racial interests - of which there are several apart from the whites." Those who know the brutal realities of "liberated" Africa will find the Macphee statement incredible. If it were not so serious, Macphee's nonsense could be the source of much hilarity.

Printed and Published by The Australian League of Rights,
145 Russell Street, Melbourne, Victoria 3000